



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,878	01/21/2000	Manuvir Das	777.361US1	6393
7590	02/24/2005		EXAMINER	
John E. Whitaker Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			KANG, INSUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**  
09/489,878

**Applicant(s)**  
DAS, MANUVIR

**Examiner**  
Insun Kang

**Art Unit**  
2124

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-36 and 52-56.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
ANIL KHATRI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 17 contains a new limitation that may require further consideration and/or search, if supported, such as "an assignment of an address of a first variable." However, it appears that this limitation is not supported by the specification. Therefore, the limitation raises the issue of new matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant argues that propagating a label is enabled by the specification. The specification reiterates this statement on page 11 and 22 but gives no explanation on how the propagation is performed. The specification appears to support the reason of propagation in page 23. However, the examiner points out that the portion in page 22 lines 24-26 recites, "the act of making a label of a location a subset of a label of another location includes an act of propagating the label." This portion does not describe the step(s) of propagating a label (how to propagate). It only states that the act of making a label includes an act of propagating the label.

The applicant argues that Andersen fails to teach or suggest "forming a relationship between two locations that are related to the two variables...indirection away from a level associated with the assignment." However, Anderson teaches such constraint sub-typing rules at assignments to one level to provide more precise alias information in a pointer analysis and to selectively unify a content of one of two locations with a content of the other of the two locations (i.e. page 35, Equation 1) as addressed in the previous office action. The applicant states that Andersen's algorithm would "require a prohibitively long amount of processing time." However, this statement does not appear to show that the reasons to combine with Steensgaard are improper as the long processing time would not make the combined teachings inoperable. Therefore, in view of the combined teachings of Steensgaard and Andersen, the rejection of claims 1-36 and 52-56 are considered proper and maintained.